

#1

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/633,938	KELLY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tam Nguyen	3764	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tam Nguyen. (3) Mr. Lach.  
 (2) Eugene F. Friedman. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 06 July 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 128, 145, 171, 198 and 228.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lach et al. '164.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



  
 JEROME DONNELLY  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claim 145 was discussed in detail and an amendment was proposed that would obviate the Lach et al. '164 reference. The amendment would be duplicated in all of the independent claims. The amendment is as follows: for example, in claim 145, all of part A) would be deleted and replaced with --(A) wrapping a belt, with first and second opposite extremities, around and in contact with a substantial majority of a patient's torso, said belt being in continuous contact with the patient's torso including the front, sides and a portion of the back of said patient's torso;--.